

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/674,283	09/29/2003	Yoshiharu Hasegawa	Fukuda Case 43	3119	
23474 7590 11/17/2004			EXAMINER		
FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 RAMBLING ROAD KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1699			MORILLO, JANELL COMBS		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1742		
			DATE MAIL ED: 11/17/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 11/17/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summan	10/674,283	HASEGAWA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
The MAN WO DATE AND	Janelle Combs-Morillo	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with ti	he correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR1.  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS (	pe timely filed days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication.	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 S	Contombor 2002		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	s action is non-final.		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex narte Quaylo, 1025 C.D. 44	prosecution as to the merits is	
N. C.	-x parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 is/are withdrawn from	om consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce	ented or b) objected to by the	Evaminor	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance S	20 37 CED 1 95(-)	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is o	phiected to Soc 27 CER 4 42441)	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	2e Action or form PTO 152	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	The analysis of the	ACCOUNT OF TOTAL 192.	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p	oriority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ⊠ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Applica	tion No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorit	y documents have been receiv	ed in this National Stage	
application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
of the attached detailed office action for a list of	i the certified copies not receiv	ed.	
		t	
Attachment(s)			
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	· (DTO 442)	
) U Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Patent and Trademark Office OL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	on Summary		

Art Unit: 1742

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-4, drawn to aluminum alloy product, classified in class 420, subclass
     553.
  - II. Claim 5, drawn to process of working and heat treating an aluminum alloy, classified in class 148, subclass 689.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a materially different process such as hot rolling.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with Terryence Chapman on November 8, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-4. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 5 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Page 3

Art Unit: 1742

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP2002-180171A (JP'171).

JP'171 teaches an aluminum alloy for automobile radiator piping (abstract) consisting of (in weight%) 0.3-1.5% Mn,  $\leq$  0.2% Cu, 0.06-0.30% Ti, 0.01-0.20% Fe, and 0.01-0.20% Si, balance aluminum (abstract), which substantially overlaps the presently claimed alloying ranges. Example #48 consists of: 0.10% Si, 0.25% Fe, 1.1% Mn, 0.35% Cu, 0.15% Ti (see Table 5), and wherein said alloy exhibits a crystal grain size of 100  $\mu$ m (see Table 6), as well as good formability (see %elongation in Table 6) and good corrosion resistance (see corrosion results in Table 6).

JP'171 does not mention Ti based compounds with a grain size of  $10~\mu m$  do not exist as an aggregate of two or more serial compounds in a single crystal grain (instant claim 1). However, because JP'171 teaches an example within the presently claimed alloying ranges, as

Application/Control Number: 10/674,283

Art Unit: 1742

well as a substantially similar method of extruding said alloy into a piping material and further annealing, then substantially the same microstructural characteristics, such as aggregates of Ti compounds, are inherently expected to occur. Therefore it is held that JP'171 anticipates the presently claimed invention.

Concerning instant claim 2, JP'171 teaches 0.4% max. Mg can be present in said alloy (see [0019]).

Concerning instant claim 3, JP'171 teaches 0.01-0.2% Cr or Zr can be present in said alloy (see [0020]).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sircar (US 5,976,278).

Sircar teaches an aluminum alloy with improved combinations of corrosion resistance and formability (abstract), wherein said alloy comprises (in weight%):  $\leq 0.03\%$  Cu, 0.1-1.2% Mn, 0.03-0.35% Ti,  $\leq 1\%$  Mg,  $\leq 0.01\%$  Ni, 0.05-1% Zn,  $\leq 0.3\%$  Zr,  $\leq 0.05\%$  Fe,  $\leq 0.05\%$  Si,  $\leq 0.2\%$  Cr (column 4 lines 27-33), which substantially overlaps the presently claimed alloying ranges in claims 1-4. Sircar teaches said alloy can be extruded into a tube (column 7 lines 10-17), and is especially useful for heat exchanger tubing (column 7 lines 26-28). Though Sircar

Application/Control Number: 10/674,283

Art Unit: 1742

Page 5

mentions a finer grain size can be achieved (column 6 lines 4—42), Sircar does not mention the average grain size or the degree the Ti based compounds are aggregated. However, because Sircar teaches a substantially overlapping alloy composition, as well as a substantially similar method of working said alloy into a tube, then substantially the same microstructural features (such as average grain size and the degree of Ti compound aggregates) are also expected to occur. Therefore, it is held that Sircar has created a prima facie case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

#### Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs-Morillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JCM (\sqrt{2}\) November 10, 2004

COPOSIUNOZONIER LITILAN EVALUER